

Date: Fri, 13 Aug 93 04:30:07 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #293
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 13 Aug 93 Volume 93 : Issue 293

Today's Topics:

 Radiogram to India
 Use of Autopatch with College Audio Conferencing Brridge?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 12 Aug 93 18:13:23 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Radiogram to India
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CBM9H3.E3u@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu (Swami Kumaresan)
writes:

>
>I am a licensed ham. Can I legally send a msg to a relative, friend, etc.
>in India who is not a ham? This is a simple question, I'd like a
>simple answer (yes/no). I don't want to start a huge discussion abt this.

The answer is no. India and the US have not signed a third party
agreement. (There's a possible way around this, but you didn't
want any discussion so I won't tell you.)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary

534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | |

Date: 12 Aug 93 23:54:47 GMT
From: microsoft!wingnut!edmitch@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Use of Autopatch with College Audio Conferencing Brridge?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The key issue under the new rules is that you will not be permitted to use ham radio for "regular" business. The rules make it okay to call a tow truck (which was always interpreted by the FCC as "okay" although it was illegal under the rules), to order a pizza, etc, as long as this is not done on a "regular" basis and there is no business relationship between you and the provider (you can't call the office to check your phone message, for example).

Your proposed application would seem to be an on-going "regular" type of operation and I do think that would not be appropriate under the rules. The FCC rules make no mention of the length of time that an autopatch may be in use. Such rules are usually established by individual repeater groups. Indeed, repeater groups are still free to ban the use of their phone patch system for any business-related communications, regardless of what the new FCC rules say.

By the way, the new rules are expected to take effect on August 31st.

Ed Mitchell
KF7VY

"Nothing said here should be considered as the law".
Heck, I've only just seen the new rule and have not studied it in depth.

Date: Thu, 12 Aug 1993 11:30:23 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!bnrgate!nmerh207!corpgate!nrtpa038!bnr.ca!harp@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug11.053728.24051@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<CBL2CE.A4B@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <11AUG199307234538@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah)

[much deleted]

>

>I still think that they is NO need for a 20wpm code test. As long as the code
>test is needed to fulfill international agreements lets make the top speed
>13 wpm and add an additional written test for the Extra level that includes

>a more complex multi-mode concept evaluation.

^^

>Erich Franz Stocker

>N3OXM

Ah yes this is what is really required for working high speed CW on the
low end of 20 where the EXTRA privileges are. This really makes alot
of sense now doesn't it.

```
*****
* Alan Harp K4PB      *      Bell-Northern Research      *      CW FOREVER      *
* mail: harp@bnr.ca  *      Research Triangle Park, NC   *
*****
```

Date: Thu, 12 Aug 1993 18:55:26 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!

cs.utexas.edu!utnut!torn!nott!bnrgate!corpgate!nrtpa038!bnr.ca!

harp@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CBL2CE.A4B@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <harp.7.0@bnr.ca>,

<12AUG199312220436@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>

Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah

In article <12AUG199312220436@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov
(ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:

>From: stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov (ERICH FRANZ STOCKER)

>Subject: Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah

>Date: 12 Aug 1993 12:22 EDT

>In article <harp.7.0@bnr.ca>, harp@bnr.ca (Alan Harp) writes...

>>

>>

>>[much deleted]

>>>

>>>I still think that they is NO need for a 20wpm code test. As long as the code
>>>test is needed to fulfill international agreements lets make the top speed
>>>13 wpm and add an additional written test for the Extra level that includes

>>

>>>a more complex multi-mode concept evaluation.

```

>>  ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>>>Erich Franz Stocker
>>>N30XM
>>
>>Ah yes this is what is really required for working high speed CW on the
>>low end of 20 where the EXTRA privileges are. This really makes alot
>>of sense now doesn't it.
>>
>>*****
>>* Alan Harp K4PB      *      Bell-Northern Research      *      CW FOREVER      *
>>* mail: harp@bnr.ca  *      Research Triangle Park, NC   *
>>*****
>
>This has to be one of the most inane responses I have ever gotten from this
>group. If the 20wpm is not required for being an Extra then there were be
>lots of people in the Extra portion of the band that don't send at 20wpm. Even
>now there are people who send faster than 20wpm and they can decide whether
>or not to slow down to talk with other or not. Or, maybe we just use the
>computer and keyboard and it can send at any speed up to some max and it
>doesn't matter what the speed level of the sender really is.
>
>For a long time General was the highest class license with all band
>privileges and during that time, most hams knew more about radio and
>electronics than we do now as a group. I might add that I knew Novices
>that knew more about radio and electronics than some Extra class hams know
>now. But, we know that its only 20wpm that truly makes a ham not electronics
>and communications knowledge. There are a lot of ways to reserve portions
>of a band for the elite few. It doesn't have to be code.
>
>I believe that every extra class ham ought to be able to pass a comprehensive
>electronics exam on the level of an entry level electronics engineer. Then I
>would gladly defer to that person's greater wisdom and right to have bands
>that they and they alone can experiment on. However, 20wpm shows nothing
>other than the ability to copy 20wpm and my computer can do it faster than
>that.
>
>Erich
>N30XM

```

I guess we are not communicating here. What I am saying is that there SHOULD be a 20WPM requirement for these portions of the band. This is the fast lane for people who send and recieve CW at high speeds just for the enjoyment of it. We don't want to use the computer to send and receive. We could use RTTY, AMTOR, etc for that. The part of the band for those modes is open to lower class licenses.

What I am saying is keep the 20wpm CW requirement for extra along with

the exclusive CW bands. Another theory exam above advanced doesn't serve any purpose other than prestige.

As far as I am concerned you can give no-coders all the phone privileges but leave the EXTRA class CW bands and 20wpm requirement alone.

When I here the first thing no-coders want is to get rid of the EXTRA class license I have a hard time understanding how that will help. This is like changing the oil to fix a flat tire.

We ain't dead yet. If we want to work CW by hand with paddles let us. If you want to join us just shut up and learn the code!

```
*****
* Alan Harp K4PB      *      Bell-Northern Research      *      CW FOREVER      *
* mail: harp@bnr.ca  *      Research Triangle Park, NC   *
*****
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #293
